Administrative Law Judge Allan J. Arlow Administrative Hearings Division Public Utility Commission of Oregon 550 Capitol Street NE, Suite 215 PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148

February 20, 2009

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

2009 FEB 23 A 8: 38

FEB 2 3 2009

RE: Idaho Power Company "Addendum: to 2006 IRP

Public Utility Commission of Otegon Administrative Hearings Bivision

Dear Administrative Law Judge Arlow:

Please help us! Idaho Power insists upon building their proposed Boardman to Hemingway 500kV transmission line through private property zoned Exclusive Farm Use, in Malheur County, regardless of the fact that public corridors are available, and regardless of the fact that our farm practices, land values, recreation, scenic views, historical landmarks, homes and health will be negatively impacted.

Idaho Power gives lip service to asking for public comment, but they state that they will go through private land. Period. They talk about minimizing, mitigating, negotiating and alternate routes which sounds reasonable until a person understands that those words mean that they may move the line a few feet or maybe even a few miles, but that they fully intend to go through farmland in our valley. The alternate routes are their alternate routes; not our alternate routes through public land, and around farmland instead of through farmland. Minimizing or mitigating does not mean that they are considering alleviating the damage they intend to inflict upon us.

Now, Idaho Power wants PUC to consider an Addendum to the 2006 IRP instead of a new 2009 Integrated Resource Plan to justify their need for the B2H line. Idaho Power seems to be ignoring the Project Order from the Department of Energy which showed that serious consideration needs to be given to alternate routes. Only one route was shown on their Addendum.

The Addendum does not address the issue of renewable power sources and it does not even adequately substantiate a need for the Sand Hollow Substation. The Sand Hollow Substation seems to be one reason why they think they need to go into Oregon.

Also, the Cost Benefit Analysis is not complete and is not in enough detail to justify choosing the B2Hline over other alternatives. Even if Idaho Power stood to make more of a profit by going through private land, why would they be allowed to take away our means of making a living. We are not rich, but we have supported ourselves and our communities for years. During an economic downturn when people are unable to find jobs, our livelihoods are being artificially threatened by a company that seems to have no concern for anything other than its own goals: not people and not our state's laws.

Please help us in stopping Idaho Power from rushing through a plan, which will destroy our economy, without considering other alternatives. Once those huge towers are in place, the damage will be irrevocable, forever.

Kesbectfully AonesHow, to the 2006 IRP instead of a new 1906 internation to the 2006 IRP instead of a new 1906 international Residue a climate institute that went to the 1001 IRP instead of a new 1909.

Fred and Pat Trenkel
Trenkel Farming & Livestock